



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,202	01/16/2004	Tomoyuki Kojima	0051-0218P	4867
2292	7590	11/25/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			MATTHEWS, TERRELL HOWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3654	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/758202	KOJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Terrell H. Matthews	3654	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Terrell H. Matthews.

(3) Carl Thompson.

(2) Kathy Matecki.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Garcia.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

- Discussed the proposed Amendment submitted by fax see attached.
- Discussed in further detail the changes made to claim 1 with specific regard to where and how the slide grooves were depicted in the drawings
- Discussed Fig. 16 of Garcia which was the primary prior art of record in regards to a clamp bar

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Kathy Matecki
Terrell H. Matthews
Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

PATENT
0051-0218P

IN THE U. S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Tomoyuki KOJIMA et al. Conf: 4867
Serial No.: 10/758,202 Art Unit: 3654
Filed: January 16, 2004 Examiner: T. Matthews
For: WORK INSPECTION SYSTEM

PROPOSED AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

(Draft for discussion with Examiner)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Due by November 23, 2005

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed May 23, 2005 (Paper No. 05052005), the following amendments and remarks are respectfully submitted in connection with the abovementioned application, the period for response being extended by three (3) months to November 23, 2005, re-identified application:

This Paper includes Amendments to the Specification, Amendments to the Drawings, Claim Set As Amended, Remarks, and One (1) Sheet of revised Formal Drawings (FIG. 2).

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 2 of 11

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Please revise the paragraph beginning on page 10, line 18 of the specification as follows:

The inspection unit 31 has an inspection probes 32 which are opposed to the base probes 36. The probes 32 and 36 are configured to contact the electrodes disposed on both ends of the works W which are stored in the work-storing pockets 9 of the conveyor table 7. Thus, the number of the inspection probes 32 should be equal to ~~ere~~ or more than the number of lines (two) of the work-storing pockets 9. The number of the inspection units 31 is determined by the number of the inspection probes 32 disposed on the inspection unit 31.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 3 of 11

CLAIM SET AS AMENDED

Claim 1 (Currently Amended): A work inspection system comprising:

a conveyor table vertically positioned, and including a plurality of work-storing pockets for storing works, the work-storing pockets being formed inside the periphery of the conveyor table;

a work supply apparatus for supplying the works to the conveyor table;

a work inspection apparatus for inspecting the works stored in the work-storing pockets of the conveyor table, the work inspection apparatus being disposed near the conveyor table; and

a sorting and ejecting apparatus for sorting the inspected works stored in the work-storing pockets of the conveyor table in accordance with a property of the works and ejecting the same;

wherein the work-storing pockets of the conveyor table are positioned along one or more concentric circles;

wherein the work inspection apparatus has a pair of probes being capable of contacting the works in the work-storing pockets from the front and rear surfaces of the conveyor table, and

wherein the probe on the rear surface side of the conveyor table is held in place by a clamp bar which is slid along a slide groove disposed on the base.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated _____
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 4 of 11

Claim 2 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 1, wherein a table base is disposed on a rear surface of the conveyor table, and circumferential vacuum sucking grooves, which are in communication with the work-storing pockets of the conveyor table and in communication with a vacuum system, are formed in the table base.

Claim 3 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 2, wherein the work-storing pockets of the conveyor tables are in communication with the vacuum sucking grooves of the table base through communication grooves.

Claim 4 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 1, wherein the work supply apparatus includes an inclined guide chute for supplying the works, which is downwardly inclined to the conveyor table; and a distribution chute for introducing the works from the inclined chute to the work-storing pockets.

Claim 5 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 1, wherein the work supply apparatus includes a horizontal guide chute for supplying the works, which is horizontally extended to the conveyor table; and a distribution chute for introducing the works from the horizontal guide chute to the work-storing pockets.

Application No. 10/758,202

Amendment dated

Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P

Art Unit: 3654

Page 5 of 11

Claim 6 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 5, wherein
a driving mechanism for driving the works in the horizontal guide chute is disposed
on the horizontal guide chute.

Claim 7 (Currently Amended): A work inspection system according to claim 4,
wherein the distribution chute has V-shaped transfer grooves ~~which are in communication~~
~~with~~ for transferring the works to the work-storing pockets.

Claim 8 (Currently Amended): A work inspection system according to claim 1,
wherein the work supply apparatus includes the horizontal guide chute for supplying
the works, which is horizontally extended to the conveyor table, and

wherein the horizontal guide chute has V-shaped transfer grooves ~~which are in~~
~~communication with~~ for transferring the works to the work-storing pockets.

Claim 9 (Previously Presented): A work inspection system according to claim 7,
wherein each V-shaped groove has a V-shaped cross-section whose opening degree is equal
to or more than 90°.

Claim 10 (Previously Presented): A work inspection system according to claim 4,
wherein the work supply apparatus further includes means for detecting a remaining amount
of the works in the distribution chute.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 6 of 11

Claim 11 (Currently Amended): A work inspection system according to claim 1, ~~wherein the work inspection apparatus has a pair of probes being capable of contacting the works in the work storing pockets from the front and rear surfaces of the conveyor table,~~ and wherein the probe on the rear surface side of the conveyor table is supported by a the base which is disposed on the rear surface of the conveyor table through the table base.

Claim 12 (Currently Amended): A work inspection system according to ~~claim 11~~ claim 1, wherein the probe on the rear surface side of the conveyor table is ~~held on the base~~ by a clamp bar which is slid on the base by a rotation of an eccentric cam.

Claim 13 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 1, wherein the sorting and ejecting apparatus includes means for jetting air to the works in the work-storing pockets, the means being disposed on the rear surface side of the conveyor table.

Claim 14 (Original): A work inspection system according to claim 2, wherein a pusher for pushing the conveyor table to disengage the same from the table base is disposed on the rear surface side of the conveyor table.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated _____
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 7 of 11

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One sheet of revised formal drawings (FIG. 2) is attached hereto in order to properly label sorting and ejection part 12 and inspection unit 31.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated _____
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 8 of 11

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, and 12 are amended. Claim 1 is independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Claim for Priority

The Examiner has not acknowledged the Applicants' claim for foreign priority based on Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-11060. Clarification is requested in the next official communication.

Amendments To The Drawings

One sheet of revised formal drawings (FIG. 2) is attached hereto in order to properly label sorting and ejection part 12 and inspection unit 31.

Claim Objections

In response to the Examiner's objection to claims 7 and 8, the Applicants have amended claims 7 and 8 to address the issues pointed out by the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia (U.S. 5,842,579);

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated _____
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 9 of 11

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Scholten (U.S. 3,097,743); and

Claims 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being unpatentable over Garcia. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Amendments to Independent Claim 1

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a work inspection system, including *inter alia*

wherein the work inspection apparatus has a pair of probes being capable of contacting the works in the work-storing pockets from the front and rear surfaces of the conveyor table, and

wherein the probe on the rear surface side of the conveyor table is held in place by a clamp bar which is slid along a slide groove disposed on the base.

By contrast, as can be seen in Garcia FIG. 8, this document fails to suggest a slide bar which is slid along a slide groove of the base. The Examiner refers to clamp bar 31 which is merely bolted to contactor module body member 29 on the front side (rather than a rear surface side) of the conveyor table 7. Garcia fails to teach a slide groove on a base or on any other element. Garcia also fails to teach a clamp bar 31 slides with respect to body member 29 or with respect to any other element.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated _____
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 10 of 11

While Scholten was combined with Garcia to reject dependent claims 7-9, as can be seen in Scholten FIG. 6, this document cannot make up for the deficiencies of Garcia to reject independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Garcia and Scholten, at least for the reasons explained above.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 7, 8, 11, and 12 are amended to place them in better form.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/758,202
Amendment dated _____
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Docket No. 0051-0218P
Art Unit: 3654
Page 11 of 11

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

D R A F T

By _____
James M. Slattery
Reg. No. 28,380
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS:CTT/ags

Attachment: One (1) Sheet of Revised Formal Drawings (FIG. 2)